DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 194 JC 030 428

AUTHOR	Abue, Peter
TITLE	The U.S. Community College Model: SUNY System--Potentials for Adaptation to International Educational Communities.
PUB DATE	2002-05-00
NOTE	24p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; Adult Education; *Community Colleges; Economic Development; *Educational Needs; *Global Approach; History; International Cooperation; Labor Force; *Leadership; Operations Research; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Cornell University NY; New York; State University of New York

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the governing operations of State University of New York (SUNY) community colleges in order to aid in the process of understanding what aspects of the U.S. model of community colleges are adaptable by international communities. The Institute for Community College Development (ICCD) is a SUNY and Cornell University partnership that visualizes a future of leadership in higher education in New York state and in the nation through their community colleges. The paper offers an overview of the history of the community college in the United States, from the emergence of junior colleges in the 1850s to the era of responsiveness to globalization from 2000 and on. The document also presents a timeline of the development of SUNY, from the 1948 state of New York legislation that created the SUNY system to the development of a system-wide community college mission and strategic plan in 2001. The model components reviewed here include: (1) Mission; (2) Governance; (3) Funding; and (4) Curriculum. The study argues that there is a shift away from the liberal arts focus and toward technology in the community college. The notion of globalization indicates that there will be expanded interest in occupational education among working adults and their employers. (Contains 23 references.) (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 480 194

Principal Investigator: Peter Abue

Project Title: The US Community College Model: SUNY system: Potentials for adaptation to international educational communities.

The Purpose: The purpose of this study is to analyze the operations of the State University of New York (SUNY) community colleges. This analysis will help the process of understanding which aspects of the US model of community colleges are adaptable by international communities of higher education. Because the history of community colleges has had great influence on the identity of community college, this study will review the historical antecedents that have affected the evolvement of community colleges in the US in general and in New York State in particular. How the history of community colleges has shaped the mission statement, governance structure, funding patterns and curriculum decisions of SUNY community colleges since its inception will constitute the model. Understanding a community college model will enable:

- A clearer understanding of the role and responsibility of the office of community colleges in creating a statewide central point of accountability for SUNY in relation to individual campuses.
- A process of developing partnership with international peer institutions, as educational communities depend on shared support services to enrich their learning experience.
- Stakeholders to develop a positive framework for contributions on clearer strategic plans that respond to the educational needs of all peoples within the local, regional state or global communities.

Process: As a document review that seeks to understand the role of community colleges in the US, this study will describe the operations of the State University of New York (SUNY) System in relation to the 30 local community colleges operated within the SUNY system, drawing parallels in the area of autonomy versus control and centralization versus decentralization.

Contributions: Visualizing a future of leadership in higher education in New York State and in the nation, the Community Colleges purport to respond to the educational needs of all people at the local, regional, state and global communities to which they belong. This study will help inform community college administrators of their strongholds as well as muddles and prepare grounds for collaborations. Since partnerships help foster economic growth and open up learning opportunities beyond the classroom for all cultures, this study will enable the Institute of community College Development (ICCD) continue to provide technical assistance to developing nations through creative and significant development of international education in community colleges.

TC030428

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Abue.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The US Community College Model:
SUNY system: Potentials for adaptation to international educational communities

1. Introduction.

2. Historical antecedents.

3. Model Components:
Mission
Governance
SUNY System
Local College System
Faculty Staff and Students
Funding
Curriculum

4. Conclusions, recommendations and Implications for adaptation:

(1) Introduction

The Institute for Community College Development (ICCD), a SUNY and Cornell University partnership visualizes a future of leadership in higher education in New York State and in the nation through its community colleges. ICCD's commitment in responding to the educational needs of all people at the local, regional, state and global communities to which they belong is through its community colleges. As accredited institutions committed to higher learning, Community Colleges in the United States of America offer the associate degree as the highest degree (Vaughan 2000). They have a strong commitment to expanding educational opportunity for all students through the policies of open-access and community building, serving as a cultural, social and intellectual hub for communities within the United States. Levin (2000) and vaghan (2000) both agree that since its inception, the identity of the community college has been influenced by diverse forces such as the rapid expansion of the public high school after 1890, the 20th century reform of American Education by university leaders and scholars, the GI bill, the baby boom, business and industry's demand for trained workers, the civil rights movement of the 1960s, federal student aid and numerous state legislations (Vaughan 2000, Levin 2000).

Since the community college has played a decisive role in higher education and development of the work force in the United States, this study will describe the operations of the State University of New York (SUNY) System in other to understand the role of community colleges in the US. SUNY operates 30 local community colleges within its system and in reviewing its operations, we shall describe the history, mission, governance structure, funding and curriculum, as they affect students, faculty and staff of community colleges. The model seeks to draw parallels in the area of autonomy versus control, centralization versus decentralization as well as system definition and structure, in relationship to SUNY and the local community colleges as envisaged by Bukovan (2001). The reason for this study seeking a description of the governing operations of SUNY community colleges is to help the process of understanding which aspects of the US model of community colleges are adaptable by international communities. As a prelude, there

was a review of the historical antecedents of the community college in the United States in general and New York State in particular.

This study will help ICCD inform community college administrators of strongholds that enhance collaborations and partnerships. Since Partnerships help foster economic growth and open up learning opportunities beyond the classroom for both cultures, this study will enable ICCD continue to provide technical assistance to developing nations as educational communities depend on shared support services to enrich their learning experience. Understanding a community college model enables a clearer understanding of the role and responsibility of the office of community colleges in creating a statewide central point of accountability for SUNY in relation to individual campuses as well as enable stakeholders develop a positive framework for contributions on clearer strategic plans that respond to the educational needs of all peoples within the local, regional, state or global communities.

(2) Historical antecedents

There are varying perceptions regarding the origins of community colleges, many scholars believe that the idea of community colleges started as junior colleges evolved from large universities wanting to limit the number of students in their universities, thus making junior colleges a means of diversion. Others feel that junior colleges' beginnings arose from the need for greater access to higher education. Those who say that junior colleges were used to divert the large influx of students into large universities appear to believe that administers of elite universities were responsible for creation of junior colleges. To enable a proper understanding of these perceptions, we shall examine a chronology of historical antecedents that will afford a better appreciation of the milestones the US community college history

1. The emergence of Junior colleges: (From 1850s) At the turn of the 20th century emerged an innovation that could be described as an experiment in higher education. Beginning with Joliet Public Junior College growing out of a high school in Illinois, a series of milestones before and after that attest to the fact that this was the era of junior colleges, from which the community college was eventually conceived

- **1850s** - Henry Tappan at the University of Michigan is conceives of the idea of Junior colleges, influenced by the German institution with a separate school to prepare students before they transferred to research oriented secondary institutions (Monroe 1992).
- **1860s** - William Rainey Harper from University of Chicago echoed Tappan's sentiments, convincing a few four-year colleges to focus solely on the first two years and dividing his university into a junior college section and a senior college section (Monroe 1972).
- **1862** - *The Morril Act,* often referred to as the land grant act emphasizing on agriculture and mechanical arts expanded access to public higher education and new types of courses and types of students (Vaughan 2000).
- **1870** - *The Kalamazoo decision* by the Michigan Supreme Court ruled that local school districts could construct and operate s comprehensive high schools from public funds, opening avenues for initial home breeding of community colleges (Vaughan 2000).
- **1889-** Henry M. Leipziger, the superintendent of a free lecture system in New York, created a the lecture system for adults; inviting various people to give talks to adults and even had them in various languages for immigrants' participation (Gratan, 1955).

- **1890s** - Alexis F. Lange and David Starr Jordon both wanted to protect the university by moving the students who were weak academically to junior colleges. Lange believed that junior colleges would provide general education and vocational instruction to "promote the general welfare" for the community (Monroe, 1972,)
- **1901** - Founding of *the Joliet Junior College*, one of the earliest large modern high schools. By 1915, increased enrolment necessitated the addition of a "Junior College wing, the nation's first major facility to be used by a public junior college (Frye 1992).
- **1904** -The Wisconsin idea: the University of Wisconsin emphasized that its mission was to assist the general public through extension services. The University declared that the entire state was its campus (Vaughan 2000).
- **1905** - University of Illinois' President felt the junior college would relieve the university of the burden of extension work and do it more economically and effectively" (Bogue 1950).
- **1910** - the second Junior college was founded in Fresno, California. Since then, a rapid expansion of community colleges in the entire United States has been observed (Frye 1992).
- **1911**- C.L. McLane founded the first junior college in Fresno, California because he believed that aside from University of California Berkeley and Stanford, California was a "state without university advantages" (Frye, 1992).
- **1917** – The North Central Association of Schools and Colleges established specific standards for the accreditation of public and private Junior colleges (Vaughan 2000).
- **1918** – Founding of the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society to encourage two-year college students with opportunities for individual growth and leadership development Vaughan (2000).
- **1920** – Founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges. More than 25 public and private junior college leaders met in St Louis to found the American Association of Junior Colleges (Vaughan 2000).
- **1921**- The California Legislation created a Junior College Fund, the nations first, to support the operation of locally governed junior college districts operating independently of the public high schools (Vaughan 2000)
- **1925** - California junior college recognized adult education as part of their responsibility (Vaughan 2000).
- **1928** – Mississippi is the first Sate to organize a state-wide governing board with specific oversight responsibilities for the public junior colleges within its boundaries (Vaughan 2000).
- **1930** – The right of a community to meet the educational needs of its citizens was challenged in Asheville, North Carolina with the North Carolina Supreme Court eventually ruling in favor of the community in the famous Asheville Decision (Vaughan 2000).
- **1939** - Adult education became recognized as a function of the junior college. The President's Commission on Higher Education planned on spending one hundred million per year for adult education (Thornton 1972).

2. The evolvement of Community Colleges (From 1940s). At the middle of the 20th century, as World War II was winding down, the nation's policy makers feared especially that there would not be enough jobs to absorb those from military service. Thus evolved a congressional bill (GI bill), which set the precedents for the students' financial aid, and the Truman commission, which gave community colleges a new name.

- **1944** – The US Congress passes the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI Bill, to provide financial assistance for Veterans of World War II who wished to pursue higher education (Vaughan, 2000).
- **1947** - The Truman Commission recommends that the term junior college be replaced by the term "community college" since many junior colleges were providing terminal degrees thus the name "junior" was no longer applicable (Brint, 1989), the overall response to the name change was positive since many felt the term junior college suggested "inferiority and subordination" The commission also called for the establishment of a network of public community colleges with little or no tuition, serving as cultural centers with a comprehensive program and emphasizing civic responsibilities within the area in which it is located (Vaughan, 2000).
- **1948** - The New York State community colleges as a system was legislated through a dual action of the state legislature that created the SUNY system and in passing concurrently the Community College law (Martens, 1985).
- **1958** – With funding support from the W. K Kellogg Foundation and Rockefeller Family, community colleges in New York, California and Florida and other states introduced the two-year programs leading to associate degrees in Nursing (Vaughan, 2000).

3. The era of expansion and open access: (From the 1960s and 1970s). With the baby boomers, the civil rights movements and the higher education acts, expansion of the community college in enrollments and numbers of campuses occurred. The children born to returning veterans, the baby boomers reached college age and realized that their future opportunities would be closely linked to a college education, the civil rights movements and the women's right broke down barriers to disadvantaged groups; and the demand for political and social action resulted in a federal commitment to increasing financial aid to higher education.

- **1960** – W.K. Kellogg Foundation announced a series of grants to be used to establish university centers preparing a new generation of two-year college leaders (Vaughan, 2000).
- **1963/65** – The federal government expands direct aid to community colleges with the adoption of the Higher education facilities Act of 1963 and the first Higher education Act of 1965, enabling communities the means to construct new campuses and enlarge existing facilities (Vaughan, 2000).
- **1968** – The league for innovation in the community college is founded by B Lamar Johnson to promote experimentation and innovation in community colleges (Vaughan, 2000).
- **1970** - The City University of New York broke with a long-standing tradition of selective admissions guaranteeing admission to all high school graduates, leading to a rapid increase in enrolments in community colleges (Vaughan 2000). The term community college incorporated both community and junior colleges. Other names that are also used to refer to similar institutions include: "City College, County College, Branch Campus, Technical Institute, Vocational Technical and Adult Education Center, People's College, Democracy's College and Anti-University College" (Cohen, 1996)
- **1971** – Federal aid granted for strengthening tribal colleges beginning with the Navajo community colleges, operating under the jurisdiction of the Native American tribes (Vaughan, 2000).

- **1972** – The American association of Junior colleges changes its name to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) to reflect the expansion mentality; also the Association of Community Colleges Trustees (ACCT) is established (Vaughan, 2000)
- **1975** – composed of chief executives of AACC member colleges, the Presidents academy is created to provide opportunities for career development through workshops and meetings (Vaughan, 2000)

This era of expansion slowed down in the late 1970s, reflecting the facts that unionization was eroding the collegial environment of the late 1060s, the State governments were facing increasing fiscal depreciation, while community colleges were running out of new populations to reach. The growth nearly finally ceased in the 1980s. Community colleges remained committed to providing the first two years of liberal arts baccalaureate education, but they also responded to economic downturns. Local and state government offered varying levels of support, but it was obvious that some states were doing better than others in the expansion rate. California was foremost while the Northeast lacked behind for many years. In 1988, the report *Building Communities: A vision for a new Century* listed recommended goals for community colleges. The summary of this report involved a challenge to community colleges to assume a leadership role in creating a renewed climate of community in their service regions.

4. The era of workforce development and corporate support (From 1990s). With the rise in public and government emphasis and attention focused on a global economy, community colleges have become affected by macro-level changes in the external environment such as the training of a globally competitive workforce. To yield to the pressures of providing education to diverse student population, serve community economic interests, and support institutional operations with adequate fiscal resources, community colleges would turn to the private sector for funds, while still striving to maintain their identity as traditional community institutions. Various corporations and educational affiliates showed support in this trend. For example the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Ford, Microsoft, Government agencies like the Department of labor, the National Science Foundation, the American Council on Education and ACT, Inc have all contributed immense resources for community colleges, making then positive variables in the education of the nation's work force (Vaughan 2000). As the economy continued to demand more highly skilled workers in order to compete in the world markets, community colleges continue to excel in workforce development, yielding to the 1990s pattern of a more corporate businesslike approach to education along with the use of new technologies (Levin 2001).

- 1992 – The association (AACJC) changed its name for the second time to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) in an effort to unify its diverse membership of comprising technical junior and community colleges (Vaughan 2000).
- 1998 – A grant form W. K Kellogg Foundation to the AACC and ACCT funded the new expeditions project to analyze the impact of the 1988 report *Building Communities* and to create a blueprint for community colleges for the 21st Century. According to Vaughan, the report recommended goals for community colleges and introduced the idea that "the word *community* should be defined not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created" (Vaughan. 2000)

5. The new millennium awareness and responsiveness to globalization (From 2000). At the dawn of the millennium, the notion of globalization, the world rapidly being molded into a

common social space, with economic and technological developments in one region having profound consequences for individuals and communities on another region is affecting the mission and values of community colleges. Polarized and contrasting judgments about the consequences of globalization can be summed up thus; while one camp view its results as catastrophic, alienating and morally repugnant, a second camp is more favorable to its effects and profiles a changed global environment, while a third camp assumes a less judgmental view of globalization and its effects, preferring the explain its conditions, origins and its implication (Levin 2001). While the global context for community colleges however, has become internalized as reflected in and reproduced by the ideology of economic efficiency, productivity and the commodificaton of education and training, community colleges have likewise responded to globalization, explaining its meaning and implications in the wake of the new circumstantial evidence.

- 2001 – The attack on America by terrorists groups on September 11 brought a new awareness to community colleges in terms of curriculum orientations, immigration patterns, electronic technologies and international alliances. While there is more caution in immigration requirements for community colleges, the community college is now being conceived as a critical link in the transformation process of turning out new Americans, a unique American invention forming a critical frontline in new war for a better world order in the war against terrorism (Mello, 2001).

The SUNY system

The post–World War 11 boom in higher education resulted in the development a comprehensive plan for education in New York State. Technical institutes were experimentally chattered on temporary campuses and located in Binghamton, Buffalo, New York City, White Plains and Utica to meet new workforce demands (Spina 2001). With impetus provided by the Truman commission and state panels, the State University of New York (SUNY) began to support and develop community colleges to train the state's changing workforce for jobs with greater technical requirements (Spina, 2001). In 1960, 18 community colleges evolved and today these colleges stand at a total of thirty (30) in number, under a central governing system at SUNY. SUNY's thirty community colleges serve over 180,000 full and part-time students, with a definite mission and a growing recognition for the need for community based two-year technical training, transfer and general education and open access (SUNY community colleges: Brief History 1948-2000). Below is a summary of the historical perspectives.[1]

- **1948 –** Enabling legislation was enacted. As a consequence of the1948 dual actions of the state legislature that created the SUNY system and in passing concurrently the Community College Law, community colleges in the New York state began as a system. The legislation also established the three funding sources (state, tuition and county) (Martens#4, 1985).

---

[1] State of New York, Report of the Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University, 1948, p.16, as quoted in Freda R. H. Martens, "The Historical Development of the Community Colleges of the State University of New York, " SUNY Community Colleges Topical Paper Number 1, Office of Community Colleges, State University of New York, September 1985, p.3.

- **1960**-18 community colleges were in existence, offering an extensive range of courses. This decade witnessed unparalleled state support for higher education, especially in capital construction, led by Governor Nelson Rockefeller (Spina, 2001)
- **1970** - The "Inger" report of 1969 recommended state aid to consist of basic aid tied to one-third of the operating budget but utilizing a predetermined rate per FTE. The report also recommended that additional aid be made available as incentive for efficient institutional and educational management, maintenance of effort in fiscal support by the sponsor, high cost of technical instruction and educational programs for the disadvantaged (Inger Report, 1969)
- **1972**-The passage of the Full Opportunity Program (FOP) law, giving rise to the Governor's recommendation of two-fifth of community college operating costs. Community colleges received additional aid (40%) as recommended by the Inger report (Inger Report, 1969)
- **1972** - Master Plan Task Force and the ensuing Chancellors Task Force: Reports on the problems of the community colleges addressed the recurring issues of ambiguous relationship and governance between the community colleges, the SUNY system and the local sponsors (NCHEMS 1999).
- **1976** - Final Report of SUNY Trustee Committee: Governance issues were reinforced in this report resulting in a series of policy statements, including a delineation of the responsibilities of the various constituencies of the community colleges.
- **1984** - Legislation allowed for regional community colleges. Providing very narrow authorization that enabled contiguous sponsors in two areas of the state to form regional community colleges.
- **1986** - Chancellors Task Force: This task force again underscored the complexity and importance of the governance relationships between the colleges and their local boards of trustees, local sponsors and SUNY. It also noted the importance of internal governance of community colleges.
- **1988** - Plan C Legislation: Refers to the shift of emphasis whereby colleges themselves became responsible for finances independent of counties. This was enacted in 1988, attempting to clarify the relationship between community colleges and specify and limit the role responsibilities and extent of control of local sponsors
- **1995** - Rethinking SUNY: The role of SUNY in community colleges governance observed in the 70s and 90s was gradually reversing. The capacity of many SUNY system offices to continue to provide services was curtailed due to the states economic condition and so this 1995 report of the SUNY board of trustees called for even greater reductions in system administration.
- **1996** - Chancellors Task Force on Community Colleges: This was an offshoot of the 1995 SUNY board of trustees' report which focused on governance, administration and relationship of community colleges to the system. The option of placing community colleges under a separate system was ruled out, including other recommendations
- **1997** – Perceiving that the 1996 recommendations were not moving quickly enough, the Presidents Association and Trustees Association authorized a study to be conducted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to support the objective of developing a strong statewide community college systems.
- **1999** – The NCHEMS report was released which focused on an analysis and recommendations pertaining to the community colleges as a system, mission and vision

governance relationship, financing and the structure for administrative coordination at the system level.

- **2001** – Development of SUNY community college-wide *mission* and vision statement and a *strategic plan* to serve as a future guide for the development of the community colleges.

(3) Model components

(i) Mission:

Community colleges in the United States have a commitment to open access, to high quality post-secondary education geared towards the building of stronger more vital communities, developing an educated citizenry and improving the labor force. With curricula that afford learners transfer and career degrees, community colleges customize programs aimed at serving specific individuals and their communities, businesses and development needs. All share a dedication to instruction and services that nurture the academic and personal achievement of such individuals with their diverse backgrounds and aspirations. The mission of community colleges can be summed up under these general themes as delineated by Vaughan (Vaughan 2000)

- **Open access and equity:** a commitment to serving all segments of society through open access admissions policy that offer equal and fair treatment to all students. Without lowering its standards for entry or transfer requirements and rather than turn away people who do not have such requirements for admissions into college-level work or professional programs, community colleges offer avenues for students to obtain the necessary prerequisites. Access became a major theme in higher education since World War 11 especially in the 1960 because; the baby boomers reached college age and realized that their future opportunities would be closely linked to a college education; the civil rights movements and the women's right broke down barriers to disadvantaged groups; and the demand for political and social action during the 1960s and 1970s resulted in a federal commitment increasing financial aid to higher education.
- **Comprehensiveness of program:** a commitment to providing a comprehensive educational program. To achieve their personal goals as well as serve community needs, students must have choice in what they study. They must chose between transfer to four year colleges where they could pursue careers that require lengthier periods of schooling and programs that lead quickly to employment. By such a comprehensive broadening program offering, community colleges create opportunities to millions of students ignored by other educational institutions. There is also a commensurate commitment to learning and teaching. The most important challenge of community college instructors is to develop the ability to adjust styles of teaching to the diverse learning styles of students, and community college faculty and administrators take great pride in their commitment to teaching and leaning.
- **Community-need based:** a commitment to serving the needs of designated geographical service area or region and beyond, including an expansion of the service area as a result of computer-based distance learning. Community colleges seek to serve communities' diverse needs ranging from transfer, vocational and technical training courses that meet community needs or by sponsoring programs or forums that enrich the service area.

Community colleges may work closely with local employers to design courses that provide employment in fields for which there is documented community need.

- **Fostering Life-Long learning pursuit**: a commitment to life-long learning encompassing a wide spectrum of activities and programs designed to enhance the lives of the people in the service area or region. With the return of older students to school in community colleges, the distinction between adult learners and full-time younger students is diminishing making learning in community colleges a lifelong pursuit.

In discussing current missions for community colleges, some have argued that social factors as well as well as educational factors come to play. One person may read a mission statement and will see an indication of what educational goals the institution most values, while another may see social class tracking or perversion of the concept of college (Townsend 1986) In an attempt to clarify these conflicting perspectives, Townsend categorizes three (3) major viewpoints that have influenced the a new concept of the community college mission.

- **Leftist**, the politically left of capitalism who advocate a classless society, view community colleges as an agency of capitalism, training middle class, blue collar, lower level people, that replicate the current class structure that favors inequities.
- **Rightist,** the educational elites who see the community college as a dilution of educational standards, opening up higher education to the masses. However, by offering vocational and remedial programs in basic subjects, the community college keep away and cater for educational riff-raffs who cannot make it in reputable universities.
- **Mainstreamists,** view education within a conventional political orientation, believing that the merits of education, is not just for the intellectual and social elites, but a path of upward mobility for all individuals to gain education and better jobs.

The SUNY Mission

According to the SUNY Strategic Plan of Community colleges for the 21st century, the **mission** of SUNY community colleges is to

"Ensure open access to high quality post secondary education and contribute significantly to the development of an educated citizenry and skilled workforce. They offer comprehensive learning opportunities ranging from transfer and career degrees to programs customized to ensure specific individual, community, business and economic development needs. All share a dedication to instruction and services that nurtures the academic and personal achievement of individuals with diverse backgrounds and aspirations".

While the **vision** of SUNY community colleges as delineated in the above document, individually and as a system

"Visualizes a future of leadership in higher education in New York State and in the nation. They are highly effective in responding to the educational needs of all people and the local, regional, state and global communities to which they belong. Innovative and flexible learning options, strategies and technologies characterize their array of constantly evolving programs and services in general education, workforce training, community service and economic development."

To achieve its goal of standing up to and meet up to challenges of a globalized world, SUNY system of community colleges adopts innovative and flexible learning options, strategies and technologies that characterize their array of constantly evolving problems, programs and services in general education workforce training, community service and economic development (SUNY Strategic Plan for 2001-2004). Thus the **strategic plan** emphasize 8-point strategic goals with specific objectives, strategies, stakeholder analysis, planned outcomes and resources required to meet each goal within a particular time frame has been set up by SUNY. The plan aims to:

- Achieve a greater system identity and the capability to act as an effective system, including coordinating and facilitating system-wide activities
- Improve local governance and state coordination roles and relationships.
- Achieve broad based recognition and promotion of the SUNY community colleges.
- Develop the role of SUNY's community colleges in Statewide and regional workforce and economic development.
- Ensure responsiveness to state wide needs by expanding the capabilities of a common framework for joint program development and delivery.
- Ensure adequate resources to support the development and operations of the community colleges, including physical facilities and technology, in a manner consistent with the system mission and vision.
- Develop and recognize the talent of faculty, staff, presidents administrators and trustees
- Implement and evaluate progress toward achieving the vision for the community colleges, and ensure overall performance effectiveness and measurable outcomes.

From the above consideration, SUNY conceives of her mission in rightist paradigm. There seem to be a strong indication that while SUNY as a system is evolving into a rightist mentality, the community college administrators are still mainstreamist in mentality. This dichotomy possibly explains the ambiguity and imbalance envisaged in governance and funding modalities. According to the NCHEMS report;

- SUNY community colleges both individually and as a system are in danger of lagging seriously behind in making the transition to becoming highly effective community colleges.
- The current governance of SUNY community colleges (encompassing the wider policy environment of finance and accountability) is a significant barrier to needed change.
- The most problematic governance issue facing several of the SUNY community colleges is the relationship with local sponsors.
- The lack of comprehensive financing policy for community colleges is undermining the capacity of the colleges to serve their students, communities and the state of New York.
- The current academic oversight and regulation of the state education department and SUNY system administration present serious barriers to the effectiveness of the SUNY community colleges and in fact of all institutions within SUNY.
- Fundamental changes will be needed within SUNY to provide effective system leadership for community colleges.

In her study conducted for 'insiders' of the community college system, the following images were conceived by Townsend, as epitomizing the mission of community colleges (Townsend 1996). Respondents voiced their opinions on the community college mission.

- **Comprehensive community College:** giving approximately equal emphasis to transfer, occupational-technical and community service programs. Both faculty and administrators preferred this direction for their individual colleges and for SUNY.
- **Academically oriented two-year college:** commits more resources to degree-oriented programs in both academic and occupational careers than community activities. This was the second most preferred direction.
- **Post Secondary Occupational Training Center:** occupational training in cooperation with industrial establishments but with little emphasis on the humanities. This also received little support from both faculty and administrators.
- **Community Based Learning Center:** de-emphasizes the formal structure of credit-hours and courses but emphasizes the community college as a center of community learning network. This received the least support from respondents.

In general insiders viewed the institutional image and mission of the community college as incorporating the three major components of open access, comprehensive curriculum and community orientation in this order of preference (Townsend 1996), showing that:

- There is a **discernable gap between insiders and outsiders** of the community college system. 'Insiders' do support the status quo, though they do not want its open access policy to be its dominant characteristic in the public eye. Insiders do believe in the community college as an institution with comprehensive curriculum, providing transfer programs, vocational training and community service.
- Though there are **strong points of agreements and disparity between faculty and administrators,** which is a positive hope for the future direction of community colleges. Faculty seems to experience tension regarding open access, while senior administrators see open access in positive way. Faculty is more enthusiastic about 'Excellence in Teaching' than Administrators. Also faculty is more supportive of comprehensive curriculum while administrators support community orientation of community colleges.

(ii) Governance

Governance as understood in academic circles is a process through which institutional decisions affecting groups, roles and role players within a system are made. Within the SUNY system, the question has always been asked how the colleges within the system can organize process in a better and more unified way to respond to statewide needs while still retaining their local autonomy. Bukovan argues that even as a loosely organized federation of thirty highly autonomous decentralized local colleges, these colleges can still be organized to attain the benefits of centralization. With strong commitment to developing a coherent strategy for capacity building and a defined role for system administration, a greater sense of "systemness" can be achieved (Bukovan 2001). An "effective system" can be characterized by opposing concepts of centralization and decentralization, control and autonomy, both working together to define a system, provided the system administration is strongly committed to support and serve the college especially by identifying specific functional areas that are most feasible for collaboration, centralization and decentralization.

Governance of the SUNY system:

As a system, SUNY coordinates its governance arrangement of community colleges in a network with other participants, working in collaboration to ensure an effective organizational structure

of community colleges. SUNY effort to develop and co-ordinate the leadership capacity if system administration is characterized by the delineation of the following functions:

- **SUNY Trustees:** who approve the establishment of community colleges in conformance with approved plans. Trustees also establish standards and regulations covering community college organization and operation. Trustees are responsible for overall policies regarding community college programs as specified in the 1972 Education Law*
- **The Chancellor**: who heads SUNY's central offices, each has a vice chancellor in charge of these offices; Finance and business, Academic affairs, External affairs and the Community college office all helping to carry out the trustees policies.
- **The Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges:** who heads the community college office and is the visible link between the chancellor, other central administrative offices and the local colleges.
- **The SUNY Faculty of community Colleges (FCCC):** which study matters relating to community college faculty and to educational problems, policies and programs. FCCC is a parallel structure of and works with the SUNY faculty Senate on matters of common concern in the conduct of university affairs. Delegates are drawn form SUNY's 30 community colleges.

The governing impact of community colleges under the SUNY system has appeared to be a history of both ambiguity and compromise, resulting into an intricate balance of power between the state and the local sponsors since its inception in 1948(Martens #2, 1985)). Martens reports that:

- In 1972, SUNY trustees took action, sanctioning a statutory law giving full power to the state university board of trustees to oversee the overall policies regarding community college programs, courses, curricula, financing arrangements, state financial assistance and tuition charges including charge-backs.
- In a 1976 final report, SUNY trustees further sought the idea of realignment in order to foster the interrelationships between each of the constituencies to achieve redefined and strengthened community college governance.
- A series of policy statements were issued by SUNY consequently, affirming its governance status in support of the new Full Opportunity Program for the community college, strengthening curricula offerings, revising budgets and delineating the responsibilities of constituencies under Plans A, B, and C
- A 1988 plan C Legislation modified all community colleges making local boards of trustees responsible for fiscal management of the college within terms of the budget. County maintained authority to approve budget in format and amount. The roles of all participants were further clarified so that governance remained a joint but carefully delineated effort of many with SUNY providing the central coordination as required by law.

Governance of Local Community College:

Though the SUNY system of administration exerts a major influence on individual colleges through shared governance, the governing process of community colleges is also influenced by internal factors such as bye-laws, committees, groups, organizational structure and the history and culture of particular institutions. The most important internal influence on governance is the formal organization is the college Presidents with their local trustees (Martens #2, 1985). In

addition, community colleges vice presidents, deans, departmental chairs and others who organize and supervise administrative support for the faculty, staff and students, various committees, forums, and councils enhance the governing process. Faculty member participate as committee and council members. Many community colleges involve support staff, labor unions all of which influence the governance of local colleges. The local governance arrangements in SUNY's thirty community colleges is generally coordinated by the following key role players.

1. The Local sponsor: According to the enabling legislation of community colleges enacted in 1948, all thirty community colleges have local government sponsorship(s), which was then set a one-third of operating costs.(Martens#4, 1985) The charge-back arrangement of 1953 reduced this proportion of local support making a sizable variation in financial obligations of the sponsors. The pressures of local sponsor impact is felt more readily in Plan A colleges because in these colleges local sponsors are more involved in the decisions that affect the educational policy. These pressures however were reduced considerably after the 1972 master Plan Task force, which dealt with problems of community colleges serving dual masters.

2. The local Board of Trustees: Local trustees

- Hiring of college Presidents
- Adopt curricula of a high school nature with the guidance and subject to the approval of SUNY and registers academic programs with the State education department
- Approve local college budgets before local government approval is sought and prior to submission to SUNY (The new regional Board of trustees send its budget directly to SUNY)[i]
- Approve Student government organizations, provide for the audits of all accounts and render reports as may be required by all government bodies.

3. Presidents: The duties of Presidents could be summarized thus:

- Promotes the educational effectiveness of the college by effectively carrying out the policies of the trustees based on the overall policies and guidelines of the SUNY trustees
- Presents recommendations to the trustees for policy actions on matters of curricular, budgets salary and fee schedules, staff appointment promotion, retention and retrenchment.
- Proposes the organizational structure of the college and plans for the development and management of all college facilities.
- Chief planning officer of the college, concerned with the maintenance of the existing resources and the acquisition of new ones.
- Submits an annual report and such other reports as may be required.
- Sees that a faculty handbook is prepared that includes an internal governance structure of faculty participation in academic matters.

4. Faculty : In general a faculty council

- Serves to operationalize the concept of collegiality, which increase shared decision making and provides a form for discussion regarding issues of an academic and curriculum nature.
- Makes the knowledge and expertise of the faculty to the administration for the purposes of informing and influencing academic policy.

- Assures opportunity for broad faculty leadership and participation in campus wide committee work
- Provides a forum for top administration to keep faculty appropriately informed on matters of institutional interest and also offers opportunity for faculty leadership development.
- Creates a mechanism for efficient communication with other campuses regarding issues of mutual interests.

5. Students: Students form themselves under campus governments and are responsible for

- Communicating with appropriate student organization representatives on matters of mutual concern within the college community.
- Reviewing and recommending policies and regulations concerning the student conduct code to the faculty and the Dean of student affairs for action. Appoint a sub-committee to deal with disciplinary matters
- Review and recommend policies pertaining to intercollegiate recreational activities i.e, athletics etc
- Review and recommend guidelines for Student handbook
- Plan Honors convocation and commencement
- Establish criteria for student disciplinary hearing.

Autonomy versus control

According to the Chancellors Task Force on Community Colleges Report of 1986, the level of autonomy of community colleges and SUNY's control needs overhaul in the areas of:

- **Governance:** SUNY has autonomy, power and authority over local boards and sponsors in the areas of sponsor funding, employment and collective bargaining. Trustees themselves are participants. Local colleges seek other sponsorship options like the regional sponsorship model or state funded model under the direct supervision and control of SUNY.
- **Relationships: The** relationships between SUNY administration, the state operated colleges and community colleges should is strengthened in relation to transfer articulations, fostering equal partnership in faculty exchange programs (incentives to receiving colleges, accessibility to community college graduates, dual transfer policies and appeal processes.) between two year and four year colleges. SUNY administration ensures an information system of data collection, support services and guidelines for inter-collegiate transfers. The office of vice chancellor coordinates with office of community colleges to alleviate deficiencies in transfer program. The office of community college follow-up studies for all community colleges in a bid to identify and promulgate models of advisement and preparation for transfers.
- **Funding:** SUNY's new formula, provides for community colleges to receive 40% of the approved operation cost or the formula amount, whichever is greater.

Faculty and staff: Martens (1985) examines trends in the characteristics of faculty and staff and evaluates it this way:

- Professional service staff in community colleges include, teaching faculty and other professional administrative staff, while non-professional service staff include the rest of the other employees. The **ratio** of students (full-time and part-time) to teachers (full-time

and part-time) varies among individual community colleges, but has been 18.5% to 1 on a composite bases for all community colleges since 1977-78.

- **Teacher salary** range from full-time lecturers (sometimes with no teaching experience) to full professor with many years of teaching experience. Individual college salaries vary, depending on the economic conditions in the sponsoring area and the salary agreements earlier bargained. Women and minority group members represent lesser percentages.
- **Faculty members are heterogeneous**, ranging from technicians, theorists, researchers, artists, to traditional professors from a variety of disciplines. Teachers teach in response to student needs and learning capabilities. They seek to extend teaching beyond the classroom by enhancing student learning and growth through skills in communication, facilitation, advisement, role modeling, large and small group dynamics, individualized instructions, practicum, audio-visual aids, and computerized instructions.
- **Promotion and tenure** depend on the individual performance of faculty members. So faculty makes use of existing programs for development viz; training workshops, tuition waivers and tuition assistance, educational leaves, conferences and involvement in faculty councils. Contributions of journal articles by faculty, is an illustration of a new commitment by faculty to seek promotion and tenure.
- Faculty recruitment was in the past problematic (little knowledge of community colleges). **Personnel policy** required orientation workshops be held to avoid faculty turnover, high among "adjunct" (part-time) faculty hired for special courses and overload assignment. Community college faculty became overloaded with work without teaching assistants. Personnel policies, therefore, required greater need for faculty capable of teaching inter-divisionally, retraining of faculty unacquainted with computerized techniques as well as training and development of newer faculty.

The NY's Taylor law of 1967 has given rise to collective bargaining among faculty and administration, leaving the Presidents and local trustees to act as referees especially in the area of staff promotion, tenure personnel evaluation, dismissal, retirement, termination, outside employment, leave of absence and sabbatical. As regards administrative titles and the salaries they carry, it is difficult to generalize.

Students:

- The **"open door" admission policy** guarantees acceptance of students from diverse socio-economic background irrespective of age, sex, marital status and national origin. Special educational needs, like high school early enrolment programs or individual student conditions like drop-outs, stop-outs, transfer students, late developers, homemakers seeking to update job skills and senior citizens seeking audits only.
- **Financial aid** is available to 60% of students from low-income families who freely participate in federal and state financial aid programs. The SUNY Equal opportunity program supports students with potentials for higher education through financial assistance and remedial instructions.
- Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student **headcount** is the best way to determine the size of the community college student body. FTE counts are developed from the credit hours taken by full-time and part-time students. Over the years, FTE counts have been used to determine the increase and decrease in **student enrollment**, transfer intakes, male and female intakes and the age brackets of students enrolled.

- The community colleges serve a local constituency. Thus educational programs offered (e.g. business, technical, health, public service and interdisciplinary programs) attenuate local community needs. An overwhelming percentage (over 96% in 1980) of full-time students have **residency** in New York State with a higher percentage (75% in 1980) known to be permanent residents of the sponsorship area, while a minimal percentage is drawn from out-of-state.
- Community colleges monitor their **graduation patterns** through **retention** and **attrition** of students. Through program changes, external remedial work and the switch from full-time to part-time status, students ensure retention even after 4 years full-time study. Attrition on the other hand occurs when students transfer to 4-year colleges or "drop-out" out entirely for a while. Attrition increases the size of part-time students while requiring extensive book-keeping for community college administrators.
- **Enrolments** take place as part-time non-credit and full-time credit. A majority of the non-credit students seeking improvement in their work skills, provision of community services, vocational or remedial instructions are available through state aid. Further aid is available for courses offered under contract with local businesses and industries. Non-credit courses that are vocational or cultural in nature do not attract state aid.

(iii) Funding

Since the evolvement of Community Colleges at the middle of the 20th century, as World War II was winding down, and the nation's policy makers set the precedents for the students' financial aid, the funding of community colleges have assumed a definitive meaning (Vaughan 2000). In 1944, the US Congress passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI Bill, to provide financial assistance for Veterans of World War II who wished to pursue higher education and in **1948,** the New York State community colleges as a system was legislated through a dual action of the state legislature that created the SUNY system and in passing concurrently the Community College law. According to Martens (1985), since the 1948 Community College law was passed, the State University of New York has made consistent efforts to ensure proper allocation and budgeting of state assistance to its 30 community colleges by adopting a funding formula. The funding partnership between the state, student and the local sponsors (Plan A, B and C) has undergone various stages of modifications.

Plan A refers to the old formula whereby counties exercised control in their finances and were able to execute financial powers like paying bills.
Plan C refers to the shift of emphasis whereby colleges themselves became responsible for finances independent of counties, while
Plan B though not really operative, refers to a combination of Plans A and C whereby there is shared responsibility between the counties and the colleges in the financial administration of community colleges.

From inception (1948), the "one-third"(33.3%) approach per partner remained the basis for providing state financial assistance to community colleges until 1970. Then a variety of bonuses and variables were introduced into the formula meant to encourage each community college to pursue their desired dynamic educational and social goals. However, these variables called for limitations on state aid, making it necessary for a new formula approach to be explored. Among these variables are:

- The rapid rise of higher education cost coupled with enrollment increases makes this formula unpredictable and thus inadequate. (In 1975, with the addition of the rental aid, state aid system wide average exceedingly rose to above 40%. In 1991, state FTE rates was reduced, contract course aid was deleted, making state-aid drop below 1/3 for the first time in 1992. In 1997 with the supplemental and disadvantaged aid deleted, the percentage of net operating cost would drop to nearly 30%.)
- The "Inger" report of 1969 and the 1970 passage of the Full Opportunity Program (FOP) law gave rise to the Governor's recommendation of two-fifth of community college operating costs. From 1971, community colleges receive additional aid (40%) as recommended by the Inger report.
- The 1973 Legislation on SUNY's maximum limitations and regulations for operating costs. The maximum limitations and regulations formula for operating costs was adopted with the sum of certain FTE calculated amounts and supplemented aid for technical FTE added.

The old formula approach to community college state aid remained the model of SUNY's funding system until all community colleges became full opportunity colleges. Since 1978, it has become more feasible for the state aid formula to be further enriched. The new SUNY formula generates community college **State share** under the following paradigms as explained by Martens (1985).

- Basic FTE state aid: State aid was provided at a guaranteed rate per FTE student with increments for various state-wide initiatives "up to" a maximum of one-third of net operating costs for all non-FOP and 40% for all FOP colleges. Since by 1978 every NYS community college had adopted the FOP they became eligible to receive 40% state aid. Aid for the disadvantaged
- Percentage of rental costs: 50% of the rental costs incurred by the college in support of state aidable enrolments would be supply by SUNY. The costs of rented physical space must exclude costs of services such as gas, heat and janitorial services where these expenses are included in the rental charges.
- Supplemental state aid for technical programs: Supplemental and "Program" aid based on approved contract courses designed to help achieve special purposes were added over the years allowing total state aid to exceed the 40% base-aid maximum.

Student share:
The NYS Education Law also stipulates that tuition and fees charged students shall be fixed so as not to exceed in the aggregate more than 1/3 of the amount of operating costs. This is excluding tuition charged to out-of-state 22students, above the resident rate

Local share:
This includes sponsor contribution, charge back revenue, out of state tuition above the resident rate and any fund balance used in the budget. The law provides in part that the local sponsor or sponsors supply one-third or four-fifteenth of the operating costs in the case of FOP colleges.

(iv) Curriculum:

The success of community college programs is not measured by the number of degrees offered or program objectives expressed by the college, but in the quality of teaching given and quality of learning achieved (Martens 1985). Only the faculty and students can testify to this. With such

a commitment to providing a comprehensive curriculum, students must have choice in what they study. Martens (1985) explains the academic programs along these lines:

- **Curriculum options** are available at community colleges, offering occupational and technical programs suitable for either continuous education, transferable to four year colleges or for development of careers for those who seek employment after a two-year curriculum. Degrees offered include Associate A, As, AAS and AOS.
- General education programs in **remedial studies** are offered in Business management, Engineering, Fine and Applied Arts degrees, leading to four-year college transfer opportunities and seek to provide broad knowledge and critical thinking that will help students clarify their values and understand the meaning of life.
- Career programs in **development studies** are offered in the fields of Business, Commerce, Data processing, Health Services, Mechanical, Engineering, Natural science, Public Service related technologies and Interdisciplinary studies, provide technical competence for the labor market. As individuals and citizens of the state and nation, these programs aid students to prepare for life by ensuring good communication skills in speech and writing upon graduation.
- **Revised approval procedures** were established since 1961 to unify community college curriculum titles, structure and course content to serve the needs of students and the communities they represent. Newer curriculum programs were developed reflecting a high interest in computer related technology. Particular attention has been given to remedial/developmental programs in cooperation with area high schools and BOCES, to widen access to regular programs and provide opportunities to part-time students previously barred from admission.
- The "one-college" concept that merges evening and week end credit courses opens access to older citizens by offering credit and non credit intellectual and cultural courses to broaden experiences and enrich lives also develop in them adults a sense of community service as an evolving mission for community colleges.

A community college plays an important role in helping businesses and industries train and develop their employees for increased productivity. Contract offering of occupational training enables FTE students to create, improve and retain jobs opportunities within the region or state.

According to Martens (1985), **Academic planning** or **programs development** is a major decision making process made at the local level but requiring statewide coordination to avoid any regional duplication. Academic planning also involves fiscal planning and budgeting to determine the resources to be obtained and allocated. A central guideline for development of a new academic program involves a back and forth communication and exchange of information between the faculty of community colleges and SUNY regarding the intent, prospectus, the academic degree to be awarded, course description, long range plans, human and material resources needed, anticipated costs expected, student probable enrolments and local resolutions passed in favor of the new program.

- SUNY established a five-year program review policy for degree and certificate programs to carry out the evaluation process. This enables up-to-date curricula and discontinuation of inadequate programs. Since 1882, community colleges joined the Multi-phase rolling plan which ties academic planning with budgeting in order to carry out SUNY's master plans.

- Community colleges increasingly offer associate degrees each year to its students and a few BA's at FIT in the same proportion as the number of students enrolled in the various programs regardless of switches, drop-outs, stop-outs and transfers. Of these degrees, majority of recipients are women, with business and health career programs topping the list.
- **Transfer of students** from community colleges to four year colleges is encouraged by SUNY. Some individual community colleges often make transfer agreements with four year colleges. A good percentage of community colleges transfer students do continue the following year at their SUNY transfer institution.
- **Academic and other pragmatic Issues:** SUNY administration in collaboration with the chancellor seeks for state funds to support the expansion of central services to the community colleges based on needs.

(4). Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications for adaptation

The following conclusions and recommendations are made in view of a consideration of the SUNY system, but may be may apply to the US community college in general and its potential for adaptation.

- There are indications of shift away from liberal arts focus to technology in community colleges. This means that continuous lifelong education and skill upgrading in and out of the workplace will be the rule. This will demand the continuous revision of curricula, programs, processes and skills development for faculty and staff. Influenced by industry needs, decision makers will continue to seek educational programs of broader scope, making education policy more centralized at the state and national levels.

- A necessary consequence of the notion of globalization in community colleges is that there will in future be an expanded interest mainly among working adults as well as their employers in non-credit skill certification and upgrading rather than traditional for-credit educational pursuits. There is envisaged a higher propensity for internet-based, distance learning programs, global and virtual schooling and industry-wide sector approaches.

- To prepare itself for this task of making community colleges the bedrock of national democracy and educational excellence, the SUNY system needs more overhaul in the area of decentralization. The diversity and complexity across the system makes it difficult to collaborate and coordinate efforts. SUNY structure should avoid such rigidity that creates an impediment to its ability to respond timely to changing educational needs and opportunities. SUNY should not be conceived as a loose federation that lacks a system identity and capability to act collectively to serve statewide, regional, national, albeit international interests.

- There is a need for a coordinated effort by individual colleges to prevent excessive college parochialism often passing as a mission autonomy, serving local communities, and clouding the vision of the larger picture inhibiting broad cooperation.

- If community colleges must maintain the mission of open access to high quality post secondary education for educated citizenry and skilled workforce, the SUNY

administration should review its focus of strategic plans towards a mainstreamist idealogy. There seem to be a strong indication that SUNY as a system is evolving into a rightist mentality, a tendency that strengthens the ambiguity and imbalance often mirrored in governance and funding rifts.

- The most problematic governance issue facing several of the SUNY community colleges is the relationship with local sponsors. If community colleges would reappraise their commitment to pragmatic financing policy that will enhance their capacity to serve their students, communities and the state of New York, then it is time to grant more autonomy to local sponsors to be active in the governance of their community colleges.

- Planning of academic programs for individual colleges should involve local communities and their regional concerns. Part of faculty initiative is to plan such programs that stem from the needs of sponsoring communities. Programs development is a major decision making process made at the local level but requiring faculty coordination more than state. However, the state involvement will be welcomed in terms of fiscal and budgeting determinations.

- It is not yet determined how much of community college graduating students do actually transfer to 4-year colleges. It is still not yet determined how much SNUY encourages this transfer process. The community college should be seen more as a University parallel, offering freshman /sophomore experience for those desiring transfer, while serving terminal programs strictly to students o advanced age or intense working experience who desire immediate entry into the workplace. For now it is not evident that a good percentage of community colleges transfer students do continue the following year at their SUNY transfer institution.

- The impact of globalization also implies that outside environment will continue to look forward to US models for collaborations. In consideration of the central role knowledge and credentialing play as power stabilizers in any society, community colleges can become key players in the political economy of the nation and international community. By its very nature, a community college appears to be a fertile ground for the prospects of adult education. By favoring adult learning and being sensitive to societal structures often mirrored in colleges through inequalities such as racism, sexism, hierarchies, and sensitivity to age, community colleges will go beyond formal schooling to consider opportunities in the wider context of individuals' living environment, providing a comprehensive view of educational activities and their interrelationships. After a thorough study of the community college model I further recommend a closer look at the following segments as potential areas for adaptations.
    1. System appraisal (decentralization, curriculum reform, Faculty support)
    2. Support system (Community learning centers for community development)
    3. Open access and equity
    4. Training the labor force (Unemployed graduates)
    5. Skills improvements (domestic, professional and interpersonal)
    6. State-college cooperation
    7. 3-tier funding system

References:

Badger, H. G. (1954). "Higher Education Statistics: 1870 to 1952." Higher Education 11(12).

Bogue, J. P. (1950). The Community College. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Brint, S., & Karabel, J., (1989). The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, R. (2001). The SUNY Community Colleges of the 21st Century: Strategic Plans for 2001 to 2004, SUNY.

Bukovan, D. S., Achieving Effective System Governance: A challenge for the Suny community colleges. EAPS 780 Advanced Seminar in Educational Administration, May 2001

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). The American Community College (Third Edition ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.,.

Fields, R. R. (1962). The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Frye, J. H. (1992). The Vision of the Public Junior College 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations. New York: Greenwood Press.

Gail Mello: The Community College Times, November 2001

Gleazer, E. J. (1970). "A Time to Change." Junior College Journal **40**(7): 3-5.

Grattan, C. H. (1955). In Quest of Knowledge: A Historical Perspective on Adult Education. New York, Association Press.

Inger, C.W., Limitations and Regulations: State Aid to the community Colleges of New York State: Report to the SUNY New York division of the budget, December 1969

Levin, J.S. (2001) Globalizing the Community College: Strategies for Change in the 21st Century. New York, Palgrave,

Martens F.R.H. The Evolution of the State University of New York: Topical Paper #4, Office of community Colleges, NYNU Albany, NY. December 1985

Martens F.R.H. Governance of the State University of New York Community Colleges: Topical Paper #2, Office of community Colleges, NYNU Albany, NY. December 1985

Martens F.R.H. Students, Faculty and Programs in SUNY community Colleges: Topical Paper #5, Office of community Colleges, NYNU Albany, NY. December 1985

Monroe, C. R. (1972). Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), A report on the relationship between SUNY and the Community Colleges, August 1999

Report of the Chancellor's Task Force on Community Colleges: SUNY Albany Central Administration. July 1986

Spina, P., (2001). A Primer for new community College Presidents and other stakeholders; an historical Analysis and a vision of what's to come: A Draft: Suny community College context Paper.

Thornton, J. W. J. (1972). The Community Junior College. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Townsend, B. K. Mission and Images for community Colleges

Vaughan, G.B. (2000), The Community College Story (2nd Ed.) Community College Press, Washington D.C.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The US Community College Model : SUNY System and the potentials for its adaptation to International educational Communities.	
Author(s): Peter Obele Abue	
Corporate Source: College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Department of Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY	Publication Date: May 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☑	Level 2A ☐	Level 2B ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Peter Obele Abue	Printed Name/Position/Title: Peter Obele Abue - Ph.D SUNY Fellow & Research Fellow.	
Organization/Address: Department of Education, Cornell University, 109 Kennedy Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853	Telephone: 607-898-4568	FAX: 607-255-7905
	E-Mail Address: POA4@cornell.edu	Date: August 28. 2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC®
Clearinghouse For
Community Colleges

University of California, Los Angeles
3051 Moore Hall
Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521

EE 45

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)